

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Applicant has amended Figure 3 as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicant has additionally amended Figure 1 to further clarify Applicant's Application.

The Replacement Drawings has been included with this Response as Attachment A.

Applicant believes no new matter has been added with these amendments.

Serial Number: 10/736,162

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated March 16, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 16, 2006.

Applicants once again appreciate the assistance of Examiner Kidest Bahta on June 8, 2006 during the in-person USPTO interview.

Claims 1-9 are pending in the Application. No amendments to Claims were made.

I. Drawing Objections

The Office Action objects to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84 (p) (5) because they do not include the reference signs mention in the description, Figure 3, reference number 26 and "the instructions".

Applicant has amended Figure 3 as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicant has additionally amended Figure 1 to further clarify Applicant's Application.

A Replacement Drawing has been included with this Response as Attachment A.

Applicant believes no new matter has been added with these amendments.

II. Claim Rejections, 35 USC §103

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 stand rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the applicant's Specification (page 5, [00035] – [00036] in view of *Francis* (US 6,600,418).

Applicant's discloses a mobile computer in Applicant's Specification however the computer from Symbol Technologies is has never been or has been ever taught to perform the method in which Applicant claims.

Applicant claims a method for loading objects on a transport vehicle. This method involves the usage of a mobile computer, similar to the one as described from Symbol Technologies in a manner with other components that Symbol Technologies computer uses.

Serial Number: 10/736,162

Applicant's invention using voice recognition and speech to text software with audio speaker equipment has an expected savings of 12 million dollars a year for only two of applicant's customers. This invention also results in a considerable reduction in forklift accidents because of the text to speech software, voice recognition software, and use of audio headsets or speakers. Additionally by providing an audio performance of the summary of objects to be loaded which includes objects ready to load, objects not ready to load, and objects remaining to be loaded forklift accidents are dramatically reduced. The forklift driver no longer has to read a display of items while driving, reducing hazards in warehouses. The use of text to speech software eliminates the need for a display except in situations where ambient noise is so loud that it is difficult to hear the spoken words. These three major points of distinction were discussed in the in person interview on June 8, 2006 in which the applicant is truly appreciative of the Examiners time. Applicant also notes that in the interview Applicant left with the Examiner the supporting documents providing proof of these costs savings and the reduction of the accident.

Applicant's Application begins by entering a user code to log onto a mobile computer. Then training the software to understand the unique accident of the forklift driver. The mobile computer then provides information from the loader applications through an audio output to the ears of the driver about the objects to be loaded. A loader application software generates a summary of the objects to be loaded and a summary of the objects is also displayed on the display as well as spoken to the driver of the forklift. The user then inputs characters identifying the object to be loaded with an audio input device, or keys on a tactile input device. Text to speech software confirms that the object can be loaded.

Francis teaches an object tracking and management system and method of using radio-frequency identification tags. *Francis* does not teach the missing elements as required by Applicant's Specification of the text to speech software providing audio summary objects to be loaded to the driver. *Francis* teaches "The display 170 may include a monitor, lights and/or a speaker or beeper", but does not teach speaking words to an operator about objects in the loading process.

Dependant Claims 2-3 and 5-9 depend upon independent Claim 1 and therefore

Serial Number: 10/736,162

include all the features thereof. Since Applicants believe that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Applicant's Application and *Francis*, Claims 2-3 and 5-9 are believed to be patentable, over *Francais*. Reconsideration of the rejection to Claims in view of the interview is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 stands rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Applicant's Specification (page 5, [00035] – [00036] in view of *Francis* (US 6,600,418) and in further view of *Manegold et al.* (US 6,671,646).

Manegold et al teaches a handheld portable device usable to store data for use in inspecting a vehicle.

Manegold et al does not teach the missing elements as required by Applicant's Specification in view of *Francis*, of the text to speech software and use of an auditory list of summary of objects which includes a list of objects ready to be loaded and an indication of objects of objects not ready to be loaded and a number of objects not yet to be loaded.

Dependant Claim 4 depends upon independent Claim 1 and therefore includes all the features thereof. Since Applicants believe that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Applicant's Application in view of *Francis*, Claim 4 is believed to be patentable as well since *Manegold* does not provide the missing elements of *François*. Applicant believes no new matter has been added with these amendments. Reconsideration of the rejection to Claims in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

III. Double Patenting

Applicant has included terminal disclaimers as Attachment B in order to obviate the double patenting rejection.

Serial Number: 10/736,162

Reconsideration of this Application with the amended claims in view of the remarks expressed throughout this Response is respectfully requested. Once again Applicant's appreciate the assistance of Examiner Kideest Bahta on June 8, 2006 during the in-person USPTO interview.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: June 9, 2006

Wendy K. Buskop
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 32,202

Please mail correspondence to:

The address associated with customer number 29637.

Wendy K.B. Buskop
Buskop Law Group, P.C.
1776 Yorktown, Suite 550
Houston, Texas 77056
713.275.3400

Serial Number: 10/736,162

ATTACHMENT A

ATTACHMENT B